

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS (a) TO STABILISE
THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NOMINAL SPECIES "BULLA
TRUNCATULA" BRUGUIERE, [1792], and (b) TO VALIDATE
THE SPECIFIC NAME "UMBILICATA" MONTAGU, 1803, AS
PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "BULLA UMBILICATA"
(CLASS GASTROPODA)

By HENNING LEMCHE

(Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 381)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers (a) to remove existing doubts as to the interpretation of the nominal species *Bulla truncatula* Bruguière, [1792] and (b) to validate the specific name *umbilicata* Montagu, 1803, as published in the combination *Bulla umbilicata* (Class Gastropoda). The problems involved are essentially distinct, but the two cases are here submitted jointly because (as will be seen) the first of these names has been applied by a few authors to the second of the two species concerned instead of to the first, the species to which that name has been applied by the great majority of workers. The two species concerned are referred to as Species "A" and Species "B" respectively in the following paragraphs.

Species "A"

2. Up to the year 1867 Species "A" was known by the specific name *truncata* Adams, 1800 (*Bulla truncata* Adams (J.), 1800, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* 5 : 1). In that year, however, Jeffreys (1867, *Brit. Conch.* 4 : 423) pointed out that the name *Bulla truncata* Adams, 1800, was invalid by reason of being a junior homonym of *Bulla truncata* Gmelin (J.F.), [1791] (in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) 1(6) : 3434). At the same time Jeffreys pointed out that the oldest available name for this species was *Bulla trunculata* Bruguière, [1792] (*Ency. méth.* (Vers) 1 : 377). Since the publication of Jeffreys's paper over ninety years ago the name *trunculata* Bruguière has come into almost universal use, having been applied to Species "A" by the great majority of workers. In an analysis published in 1948 (*Danske Vidensk. Slsk. biol. Skr.* 5 (No. 3) : 83—84) I showed that of the 80 authors who had dealt with this common European species from localities in the Atlantic Ocean north of Latitude 40° N. since the publication of Jeffreys's paper 65 (81 per cent.) had applied the name *truncatula* Bruguière to it, while of the remaining 15 authors, ten continued to use the name *truncata* Adams.

3. Reference must be made here to two other early names which either apply to, or are alleged to apply to, Species "A". These names are the following:—

(a) In 1804 the nominal species *Bulla jeverensis* was established by Schröter (*Archiv. Zool.* (Wiedemann) 4(1) : 16). The species so named is either *Bulla truncatula* Bruguière (as currently interpreted) or *Bulla obtusa* Montagu, 1807. Menke (1830, *Syn. méth. Moll. Gen. Spec.* (ed. 2) : 13) identified this nominal species with *truncatula* Adams (i.e. with *truncatula* Bruguière) and in this he was followed many years later by Marshall (1912, *J. Conch.* 13 : 330). The specific name *jeverensis* Schröter has been used only once for the area of the North Atlantic, namely by Paetel (1888, *Syst. Aufzähl. sömmt. Conch. Sammlung Paetel* (ed. 4) 1) where he cited it (: 622) (in combination with the generic name *Cylichna*) side by side with the name *truncatula* Bruguière which he cited (: 634) (in combination with the generic name *Utriculus*). No figure was given by Schröter for his nominal species *Bulla jeverensis* and a final identification of the taxon so named is impossible. The only present importance of this name resides in the fact that it would be a constant threat to stability if it were to be decided to adopt some later name for Species "A".

(b) The other name which requires to be considered is *Bulla retusa* Maton & Rackett, 1807 (*Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* 8 : 128). This name, which was published as a replacement name for the invalid homonym *Bulla truncatula* Adams, 1800 (see paragraph 2 above), is the oldest available name which can with full certainty be applied to Species "A". It was used in this sense by a number of early authors (Turton, 1807, 1819; Davies, 1812; Dillwyn, 1817; Wood, 1818; Brown, 1827 (as *Volvaria retusa*). Quite recently an attempt was made to reintroduce this name by Winckworth (1932), who was followed by Fischer (1935).

4. The specific name *retusa* Maton & Rackett was reintroduced by Winckworth in a checklist of the British Marine Mollusca (1935, *J. Conch.* 19 : 231). He was unable on that occasion on grounds of space to explain why he considered this change necessary. Later, however, he kindly furnished me (*in litt.*) with the following explanation: "Bruguière's description [of his *truncatula*] is detailed and suggests *R. umbilicata* rather than *R. retusa*. This is borne out by the reference to Plancus's figure, which is an excellent portrait of *R. nitidula* [now recognised as a variety of *umbilicata*] but would not be quoted in connexion with *R. retusa*. Bruguière quotes Plancus's locality, but his own specimens were fossils from Courtagnon". In taking this view Winckworth adopted the same argument as had been advanced many years earlier by Morch (1872, *Vid. Medd. naturh. Foren. Kjob. f.* 1871 : 176) who had written as follows: "Bruguière in his description mentions neither the

deep spire nor the characteristic longitudinal furrows on the hindmost part of the shell. The references to Plancus and Solani are to two quite different species. As supposed also by Philippi, *Bulla umbilicata* is more probably the species of Bruguière " [translation by the present author]. A renewed examination by myself (Lemche, 1948 : 56) inclined me, however, to the view that on balance it was likely that *B. truncatula* Bruguière was the same species as that which later was given the name *B. retusa* by Maton & Rackett.

5. It would clearly be most undesirable that doubts should be allowed to continue as to the specific name properly applicable to so common and well-known a species as Species "A". It is necessary therefore to consider how best this can be avoided. One solution may be entirely ruled out, namely the adoption of the specific name *truncatula* Bruguière for the species later named *Bulla umbilicata* by Montagu [= Species "B" discussed in paragraph 7 below], for such an arrangement would have the double disadvantage (a) of depriving Species "A" of the name by which it has been known by almost all authors for the last ninety years, and (b) of depriving Species "B" of the name *umbilicata* Montagu which has been used for it for more than a century and a half and in addition of applying to that species a name which (as explained above) has for so long been applied to Species "A". A second course would be for the Commission to use its Plenary Powers to suppress the specific name *truncatula* Bruguière for the purpose of paving the way for the adoption of the specific name *retusa* Maton & Rackett, 1807. Such a solution would require also the suppression by the Commission under its Plenary Powers of the specific name *jeveensis* Schröter, 1804, which has priority over *retusa* Maton & Rackett and (as explained in paragraph 3(a) above) has also been identified—though doubtfully—with Species "A". Quite apart from this consideration, I am opposed to such a solution because it would deprive Species "A" quite unnecessarily of the specific name *truncatula* Bruguière which it has borne for so many years and would thus involve an unwarranted break in the continuity of the nomenclature of this group.

6. While, as I have explained (paragraph 4 above) I am of the opinion that the nominal species *Bulla truncatula* Bruguière can properly be interpreted as representing Species "A", I agree that Bruguière's description is unsatisfactory and may contain elements referring to other species. I have considered whether this difficulty could be overcome by the selection of a lectotype for Bruguière's species or by the selection of some specified portion of his description to represent the lectotype, but I am of the opinion that this course is not feasible. I have reached the conclusion therefore that it would only be possible for the above name to be unquestionably linked with Species "A" by the Commission, acting under its Plenary Powers, either to approve a neotype for this species or to direct that Bruguière's nominal species be interpreted by reference to some later published description which refers beyond doubt

to Species "A". Of these courses the latter seems to me the most convenient in the present case. I therefore recommend that, in order to provide a sure basis for the long established and, in my view, correct use of the specific name *truncatula* Bruguière for Species "A", the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to direct that the nominal species *Bulla truncatula* Bruguière, [1792], be interpreted by reference to the specimen on which was based the later nominal species *Bulla truncata* Adams, 1800. Such a solution will in addition remove the threat to the name currently applied to Species "B" represented by the name *truncatula* Bruguière from the standpoint of any author who may share Winckworth's view that that name applies to, and is the oldest available name for, Species "B".

Species "B"

7. The oldest name certainly applicable to Species "B" and the name which for the past century and a half has been used for that species is *Bulla umbilicata* Montagu, 1803 (*Testacea brit.* 1 : 222). Iredale (1915, *Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* 11 : 340) pointed out, however, that the above name is invalid as a junior homonym of *Bulla umbilicata* Röding, 1798 (*Mus. Bollen.* : 15). The taxon so named by Röding is a true *Bulla*, but the name *umbilicatus* Röding is not required and has never been used by any subsequent author. If as the result of the foregoing circumstances it were necessary to abandon the name *umbilicata* Montagu, the species so long known by that name would need to assume the little-known name *Volvaria subcylindrica* Brown, 1827 (*Ill. rec. Conch.* : pl. 38). It would, however, be intolerable that a long neglected name such as *umbilicata* Röding—especially one which was published in a work which was not declared to be available for nomenclatorial purposes until as recently as 1926 on the publication of the Commission's *Opinion* 96—should be allowed to overturn the consistent usage of a hundred and fifty years by relegating to synonymy the well-known name *umbilicata* Montagu, 1803. It would clearly be in harmony with the principle of stability so emphatically laid down by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology at Copenhagen in 1953 that the name *umbilicata* Röding, 1798, should be suppressed by the Commission under its Plenary Powers and I accordingly recommend that this should be done.

Recommendations

8. In the light of the considerations set out in the present application I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers :—

- (a) to give a Ruling that the nominal species *Bulla truncatula* Bruguière, [1792], be interpreted by reference to the specimen upon which Adams (J.) in 1800 based the nominal species *Bulla truncata* ;

- (b) to suppress the specific name *umbilicata* Röding, 1798, as published in the combination *Bulla umbilicata*, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (2) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—
- (a) *truncatula* Bruguière, [1792], as published in the combination *Bulla truncatula*, and as interpreted under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above ;
- (b) *umbilicata* Montagu, 1803, as published in the combination *Bulla umbilicata*, as validated under the Plenary Powers in (1)(b) above ;
- (3) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* :—
- (a) *truncata* Adams (J.), 1800, as published in the combination *Bulla truncata* (a junior homonym of *truncata* Gmelin (J.F.), [1791], as published in the combination *Bulla truncata* and, under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above, a junior objective synonym of *truncatula* Bruguière, [1792], as published in the combination *Bulla truncatula*) ;
- (b) *retusa* Maton & Rackett, 1807, as published in the combination *Bulla retusa* (a junior objective synonym of *truncata* Adams (J.), 1800, as published in the combination *Bulla truncata*, and therefore, under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above, a junior objective synonym of *truncatula* Bruguière, [1792], as published in the combination *Bulla truncatula*) ;
- (c) *umbilicata* Röding, 1798, as published in the combination *Bulla umbilicata*, as proposed in (1)(b) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

SUPPORT FOR THE APPLICATION BY R. P. TRIPP AND W. F. WHITTARD REGARDING THE GENERIC NAME "ENCRINURUS"
EMMRICH, 1844 (CLASS TRILOBITA)

By JAMES L. BEGG

(Glasgow)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1059)

(For the proposal in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 12 : 259—263)

(Letter dated 18th March 1957)

I have read the separate by my friends Mr. Ronald Tripp and Professor Whittard. The trilobite pygidium figured on Plate 3 I have always identified as *Encrinurus punctatus* Emmerich, but in view of what is stated in the *Bulletin* I quite agree that it should now be named *Entomostracites punctatus* Wahlenberg.